

HÖLDER CONTINUITY OF LYAPUNOV EXPONENT FOR QUASI-PERIODIC JACOBI OPERATORS

KAI TAO

ABSTRACT. We consider the quasi-periodic Jacobi operator $H_{x,\omega}$ in $l^2(\mathbb{Z})$

$$(H_{x,\omega}\phi)(n) = -b(x + (n+1)\omega)\phi(n+1) - b(x + n\omega)\phi(n-1) + a(x + n\omega)\phi(n) = E\phi(n), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $a(x)$, $b(x)$ are analytic function on $\mathbb{T}$, b is not identically zero, and ω obeys some strong Diophantine condition. We consider the corresponding unimodular cocycle. We prove that if the Lyapunov exponent $L(E)$ of the cocycle is positive for some $E = E_0$, then there exists $\rho_0 = \rho_0(a, b, \omega, E_0)$, $\beta = \beta(a, b, \omega)$ such that $|L(E) - L(E')| < |E - E'|^\beta$ for any $E, E' \in (E_0 - \rho_0, E_0 + \rho_0)$. If $L(E) > 0$ for all E in some compact interval I then $L(E)$ is Hölder continuous on I with a Hölder exponent $\beta = \beta(a, b, \omega, I)$. In our derivation we follow the refined version of the Goldstein-Schlag method [GS] developed by Bourgain and Jitomirskaya [BJ].

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the quasi-periodic Jacobi operator $H_{x,\omega}$ in $l^2(\mathbb{Z})$

$$(H_{x,\omega}\phi)(n) = -b(x + (n+1)\omega)\phi(n+1) - b(x + n\omega)\phi(n-1) + a(x + n\omega)\phi(n) = E\phi(n), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $a(x)$, $b(x)$ are analytic function on $\mathbb{T}$, b is not identically zero. Set

$$A(x, E, \omega) = \frac{1}{b(x + \omega)} \begin{pmatrix} a(x) - E & -b(x) \\ b(x + \omega) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

$$M_N(x, E, \omega) = M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) = A(x + (N-1)\omega, E, \omega)A(x + (N-2)\omega, E, \omega) \cdots A(x, E, \omega),$$

Define the unimodular matrix

$$\tilde{M}_N(x, E, \omega) = \tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) := \frac{M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)}{|\det M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

As

$$\det A(x, E, \omega) = \frac{b(x)}{b(x + \omega)},$$

then

$$(1.1) \quad \det M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) = \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{b(x + n\omega)}{b(x + (n+1)\omega)} = \frac{b(x)}{b(x + N\omega)},$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad \log \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| = \log \|M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| - \frac{1}{2} \log \left| \frac{b(x)}{b(x + N\omega)} \right|.$$

Remark 1.1. (1) Note that

$$\|A(x, E, \omega)\| \leq \frac{C(a, b, E)}{|b(x + \omega)|},$$

where the constants $C(a, b, E)$ obeys $C(a, b, E_0) = \sup_{|E| \leq E_0} C(a, b, E) < +\infty$. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{N} \log \|M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| \leq \log C(a, b, E) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log |b(x + n\omega)|.$$

This work was done during 2010-2011 year when author was a visiting doctoral student at the Department of Mathematics University of Toronto. The author wishes to thank M.Goldstein for his supervision of the project.

In this paper we always assume that $|E| \leq E_0$, where E_0 depends on a, b . For that matter we suppress E from the notations of some of the constants involved.

(2) $\log \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| \geq 0$, since $\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)$ is unimodular.

(3)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{N} \log \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| = \frac{1}{N} \log \|M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| - \frac{1}{2N} \log \left| \frac{b(x)}{b(x + N\omega)} \right| \\ &\leq \log C(a, b, E) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \log |b(x + n\omega)| - \frac{1}{2N} \log \left| \frac{b(x)}{b(x + N\omega)} \right| \end{aligned}$$

(4) It is well-known fact that if b is analytic function which is not identically zero then $(\log |b|)^2$ is integrable. Set

$$D = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log |b(\theta)| d\theta.$$

Therefore

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \log \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| \right| dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{N} \log \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| dx \leq C'(a, b) - D := C''(a, b).$$

Similarly

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\frac{1}{N} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E, \omega)\| \right)^2 dx \leq \tilde{C}(a, b).$$

(5) Combining (4) with (1.2), we concludes that $\frac{1}{N} \log \|M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\|$ is integrable, and

$$\frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \|M_N(x, E, \omega)\| dx = \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E, \omega)\| dx.$$

Set

$$L_N(E, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \|M_N(x, E, \omega)\| dx = \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E, \omega)\| dx.$$

Note that $L_N(E, \omega) > 0$. Set

$$B(x, E, \omega) := \begin{pmatrix} a(x) - E & -b(x) \\ b(x + \omega) & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$T_N(x, E, \omega) = T_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) := B(x + (N-1)\omega, E, \omega) B(x + (N-2)\omega, E, \omega) \cdots B(x, E, \omega).$$

Then

$$M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) = T_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) \prod_{n=N-1}^0 \frac{1}{b(x + (n+1)\omega)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} (1.3) \quad \tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) &= \frac{|b(x + N\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|b(x)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} M_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega) \\ &= \frac{|b(x + N\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|b(x)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{b(x + (n+1)\omega)} T_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega), \end{aligned}$$

$$(1.4) \quad \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| = \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{|b(x + n\omega)b(x + (n+1)\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \|T_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\|,$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad \log \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| = \log \|T_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log |b(x + n\omega)b(x + (n+1)\omega)|.$$

Note also for the future references that

$$(1.6) \quad |\det T_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)| = \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} |b(x + n\omega)| |b(x + (n+1)\omega)|.$$

Combining (1.5) with Remark 1.1, one concludes that $\frac{1}{N} \log \|T_{[1,N]}(x, E, \omega)\|$ is integrable,

$$(1.7) \quad J_N(E, \omega) := \frac{1}{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log \|T_{[1,N]}(x, \omega)\| dx = L_N(E, \omega) + D.$$

Due to the subadditive property, the limits

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} L(E, \omega) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{N} \log \|M_N(x, E, \omega)\| dx = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{N} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E, \omega)\| dx \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} L_N(E, \omega), \end{aligned}$$

$$(1.9) \quad J(E, \omega) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{N} \log \|T_N(x, E, \omega)\| dx = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} J_N(E, \omega) = L(E, \omega) + D$$

exist. Moreover, $L(E, \omega) \geq 0$. Fix some $\alpha > 1$. Throughout this paper we assume that $\omega \in (0, 1)$ satisfies the Diophantine condition

$$(1.10) \quad \|n\omega\| \geq \frac{C_\omega}{n(\log n)^\alpha} \text{ for all } n.$$

It is well known that for a fixed $\alpha > 1$ almost every ω satisfies (1.10).

The main theorem in this paper is

Theorem 1.2. *Assume $L(E_0) > 0$. Then there exists $\rho_0 > 0$ depending on $a(x), b(x), \omega$ and E_0 such that for any $E, E' \in (E_0 - \rho_0, E_0 + \rho_0)$ holds*

$$|L(E) - L(E')| = |J(E) - J(E')| < |E - E'|^\beta,$$

where the constant β here depends on $a(x), b(x), \omega$, i.e. $\beta = \beta(a, b, \omega)$, but does not depend on E_0 .

2. LARGE DEVIATION THEOREM

It is convenient to replace $a(x), b(x)$ by $p(e(x))$ and $q(re(x))$ (with $e(x) = e^{2\pi i x}$), where $p(z), q(z)$ are analytic function in the annulus $A_\rho = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : 1 - \rho < |z| < 1 + \rho\}$ which assume only real values for $|z| = 1$. With this convention in place, we will use the notation $B(z), T_{[1,N]}(z)$ e.t.c..

Lemma 2.1. (1) $\sup_{z \in A_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} \|B(z)\| = \sup_{z \in A_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} p(z) - E & -q(z) \\ q(ze(\omega)) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq C$, where $C = C(p, q)$, and $C(p, q)$ is the same as in (1) of Remark 1.1.
 (2) $\sup_{z \in A_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} \|B^{-1}(z)\| \leq \frac{C(p, q)}{|q(ze(\omega))q(z)|}$

Proof. (1) is obvious;

$$(2) \det B(z) = q(ze(\omega))q(z), \text{ and } B^{-1}(z) = \frac{1}{q(z)q(ze(\omega))} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & q(z) \\ -q(ze(\omega)) & p(z) - E \end{pmatrix}, \text{ that implies (2).} \quad \square$$

So

Lemma 2.2. *For any $z \in A_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$,*

$$(2.1) \quad -C_1(p, q) + \log |q(z)q(ze(\omega))| \leq \log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(\omega))\| \leq C_1(p, q) - \log |q(ze((N-1)\omega))q(ze(N\omega))|.$$

Proof. $T_{[1,N]}(ze(\omega)) = B(ze(N\omega))T_{[1,N]}(z)B^{-1}(z)$, so $\|T_{[1,N]}(ze(\omega))\| \leq C(p, q)\|T_{[1,N]}(z)\|^{\frac{C(p,q)}{|q(z)q(ze(\omega))|}}$.
 $\Rightarrow \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(\omega))\| \leq 2 \log C(p, q) + \log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \log |q(z)q(ze(\omega))|$.

Similarly, we have

$$\log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| \leq 2 \log C(p, q) + \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(\omega))\| - \log |q(ze((N-1)\omega))q(ze(N\omega))|.$$

Thus

$$-C_1 + \log |q(z)q(ze(\omega))| \leq \log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(\omega))\| \leq C_1 - \log |q(ze((N-1)\omega))q(ze(N\omega))|,$$

where $C_1 = C_1(p, q)$. □

Corollary 2.3. (1)

$$\begin{aligned} -kC_1 + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \log |q(ze((m+1)\omega))q(ze((m)\omega))| &\leq \log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(k\omega))\| \\ &\leq kC_1 - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \log |q(ze((N+m-1)\omega))q(ze((N+m)\omega))| \end{aligned}$$

(2)

$$\begin{aligned} -KC_1 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze(k\omega))q(ze((k+1)\omega))| &\leq \log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(k\omega))\| \\ &\leq KC_1 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k-1+N)\omega))q(ze((k+N)\omega))|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (1) is obvious;

(2) For $1 \leq k \leq K$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{kC_1}{K} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{K} \log |q(ze((m+1)\omega))q(ze((m)\omega))| &\leq \frac{1}{K} \log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \frac{1}{K} \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(k\omega))\| \\ &\leq \frac{kC_1}{K} - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{K} \log |q(ze((N+m-1)\omega))q(ze((N+m)\omega))|. \end{aligned}$$

As

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{K} \log |q(ze((m+1)\omega))q(ze((m)\omega))| = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k+1)\omega))q(ze((k)\omega))|$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{kC_1}{K} \leq \sum_{k=1}^K C_1 = KC_1,$$

then

$$\log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{K} \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(k\omega))\| \geq -KC_1 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k+1)\omega))q(ze((k)\omega))|.$$

Also

$$\log \|T_{[1,N]}(z)\| - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{K} \log \|T_{[1,N]}(ze(k\omega))\| \leq KC_1 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k-1+N)\omega))q(ze((k+N)\omega))|.$$

□

Lemma 2.4. *Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a subharmonic function on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $\partial\Omega$ consists of finitely many piece-wise C^1 curves. There exists a positive measure μ on Ω such that for any $\Omega_1 \Subset \Omega$ (i.e., Ω_1 is a compactly contained subregion of Ω)*

$$(2.2) \quad u(z) = \int_{\Omega_1} \log |z - \zeta| d\mu(\zeta) + h(z)$$

where h is harmonic on Ω_1 and μ is unique with this property. Moreover, μ and h satisfy the bounds

$$(2.3) \quad \mu(\Omega_1) \leq C(\Omega, \Omega_1) (\sup_{\Omega} u - \sup_{\Omega_1} u)$$

$$(2.4) \quad \|h - \sup_{\Omega_1} u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} \leq C(\Omega, \Omega_1, \Omega_2) (\sup_{\Omega} u - \sup_{\Omega_1} u)$$

for any $\Omega_2 \Subset \Omega_1$.

For the proof See Lemma 2.2 in [GS1].

Theorem 2.5. *Let u be a subharmonic function defined in the annulus A_ρ . Suppose furthermore that $|u(z)| \leq 1$. Then for any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$*

$$(2.5) \quad \text{mes}(\{x : |\sum_{k=1}^n u(re(x - k\omega)) - n < u(re(\cdot)) > | > \delta n\}) < \exp(-c\delta n + s_n),$$

where $< u(re(\cdot)) > := \int_0^1 u(re(y)) dy$, $s_n \leq C(\log n)^A$ for general n and $s_n \leq C \log n$ if $n = q_j$ for any j .

For the proof see Theorem 3.8 in [GS].

Remark 2.6. (1) The constants c, C here do not depend on δ .

(2) Actually, the condition $|u(z)| \leq 1$ can be replaced by $u(z) = \int \log |z - \zeta| d\mu(\zeta) + h(z)$, with $\|\mu\| + \|h\| \leq C$, see the proof of Theorem 3.8 in [GS]

In what follows we will use the following version

Theorem 2.7. *Let u be a subharmonic function defined in the annulus A_ρ . Suppose furthermore that $u(z) = \int \log |z - \zeta| d\mu(\zeta) + h(z)$, with $\mu(A_{\frac{\rho}{2}}) + \|h\|_{L^\infty(A_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \leq \hat{C}$. Then for any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$*

$$(2.6) \quad \text{mes}(\{x : |\sum_{k=1}^n u(re(x + k\omega)) - n < u(re(\cdot)) > | > \delta n\}) < \exp(-c\delta n).$$

where $c = c(\hat{C}, \omega)$.

Set $u_N(z, E, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \log \|T_N(z, E, \omega)\|$, $\tilde{u}_N(z, E, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(z, E, \omega)\|$. Sometimes we use $u_N(z)$ or u_N for short. It is also the same for $\tilde{u}_N(z, E, \omega)$. Let $L_{N,r}(E) = \langle \tilde{u}_N(re(\cdot)) \rangle$, $D_r = \langle \log |q(re(\cdot))| \rangle$, $J_{N,r}(E) = \langle u_N(re(\cdot)) \rangle = L_{N,r}(E) + D_r$. For $r = 1$ we use the notations $L_N(E)$, D , $J_N(E)$.

Lemma 2.8. *Function $u_N(z)$ is subharmonic in A_ρ and obeys $u_N(z) \leq C(p, q)$.*

Proof. Since $B(z)$ is analytic in A_ρ , so is $T_N(z)$. Therefore $u_N(z) = \frac{1}{N} \log \|T_N(z)\|$ is subharmonic in A_ρ . The estimate $u_N(z) \leq C(p, q)$ follows from Lemma 2.1. $\square$

Lemma 2.9. *There exists $C_2(q) < +\infty$ s.t.*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}} u_N(e(x)) \geq -C_2(q).$$

Proof. One has $\|A\|^2 \geq |\det A|$ for any 2×2 matrix. So

$$u_N(z) \geq \frac{1}{2N} \log |\det T_N(z)| = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log |q(ze(n\omega))q(ze((n+1)\omega))|,$$

see (1.6). Recall that $\log |q(e(x))|$ is integrable. So, $\frac{1}{2} \log |q(e(x))q(e(x+\omega))|$ is integrable. So,

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{1}{2} \log |q(e(x))q(e(x+\omega))| \right| dx = C_2(q) < +\infty.$$

Therefore

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log |q(e(x+n\omega))q(e(x+(n+1)\omega))| \right| dx \leq C_2(q) < +\infty.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log |q(e(x+n\omega))q(e(x+(n+1)\omega))| \geq -C_2(q).$$

□

Lemma 2.10. *One has*

$$u_N(z) = \int \log |z - \zeta| d\mu(\zeta) + h(z),$$

where

$$\mu(A_{\frac{\rho}{2}}) \leq C_3(p, q), \quad \|h\|_{L^\infty(A_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \leq C_3(p, q).$$

Proof. The statement follows from Lemma 2.8, 2.9, and (2.3), (2.4). □

Remark 2.11. By (2.7), we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{2} \log |q(re(x))q(re(x+\omega))| \geq -C_2(q).$$

Then by Lemma 2.9, and (2.3), (2.4), one has

$$\frac{1}{2} \log |q(re(x))q(re(x+\omega))| = \int \log |z - \zeta| d\mu_q(\zeta) + h_q(\zeta),$$

where

$$\mu_q(A_{\frac{\rho}{2}}) \leq C_q, \quad \|h\|_{L^\infty(A_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \leq C_q.$$

By Theorem 2.7 and Lemma 2.10, we have

Lemma 2.12. *For any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$, δ and K ,*

$$(2.8) \quad \text{mes}(\{x : \left| \sum_{k=1}^K u_N(re(x+k\omega)) - K < u_N(re(\cdot)) > | > \delta K \right| \}) < \exp(-c\delta K),$$

where $c = c(p, q, \omega)$.

Remark 2.13. (1) By Remark 2.11 and Theorem 2.7, also for any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} < r < 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$, δ and K

$$\text{mes}(\{x : \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{2} \log |q(re(x+k\omega))q(re(x+(k+1)\omega))| - K < \frac{1}{2} \log |q(re(x))q(re(x+\omega))| > | > \delta K \right| \}) < \exp(-c_q \delta K).$$

(2) It is well-known that $\int_0^1 |\log |q(re(x))|| dx \leq C'_q$, for any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$, if $b(x)$ is analytic.

(3) Due to (1.5) one has

$$\tilde{u}_N(re(x)) = u_N(re(x)) - \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{k=1}^N \log |q(re(x+k\omega))q(re(x+(k+1)\omega))|.$$

Hence,

$$\text{mes} \{x : \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(re(x+k\omega)) - K < \tilde{u}_N(re(\cdot)) > | > \delta K \right| \} \leq \exp(-c\delta K) + K \exp(-c_q \delta K).$$

What's more, there exists $\check{K} = \check{K}(p, q, \delta)$, s.t. for any $K \geq \check{K}$,

$$\text{mes} \left\{ x : \left| \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(re(x + k\omega)) - K < \tilde{u}_N(re(\cdot)) > \right| > \delta K \right\} \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta K).$$

Lemma 2.14. For any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$, δ and K

$$\text{mes} \left(\left\{ x : \left| \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(re(x + k\omega))q(re((x + k + 1)\omega))| - (K + 1)D_r \right| > \delta K \right\} \right) \leq K \exp(-c_q \delta K),$$

where c_q is as in Remark 2.13.

Proof. Set

$$\mathbb{X}_r := \left\{ x : \left| \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(re(x + k\omega))q(re((x + k + 1)\omega))| - (K + 1)D_r \right| > \delta K \right\},$$

and

$$Q_r(x) = \log |q(re(x))q(re(x + \omega))| - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log |q(re(x))q(re(x + \omega))| dx = \log |q(re(x))q(re(x + \omega))| - 2D_r.$$

Note also that $\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} = \frac{K+1}{2}$, and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(re(x + k\omega))q(re((x + k + 1)\omega))| - (K + 1)D_r = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} Q_r(x + k\omega).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(re(x + k\omega))q(re((x + k + 1)\omega))| - (K + 1)D_r \right| > \delta K \\ & \Leftrightarrow \left| \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} Q_r(x + k\omega) \right| > \delta K, \text{ and } < Q_r > = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Define $S_{k,r}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} Q_r(x + j\omega)$, then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} Q_r(x + k\omega) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K S_k(x).$$

Set $\mathbb{X}_{k,r} := \{x : |S_{k,r}(x)| > \delta K\}$, then

$$\mathbb{X}_r \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^K \mathbb{X}_{k,r}, \quad \text{mes}(\mathbb{X}_r) \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \text{mes}(\mathbb{X}_{k,r}).$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{X}_{k,r} = \left\{ x : \left| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \log |q(re(x + j\omega))q(re(x + (j + 1)\omega))| - k \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log |q(re(x))q(re(x + \omega))| dx \right| > \delta K \right\}.$$

Thus, by Remark 2.13

$$\text{mes} \mathbb{X}_{k,r} = \left\{ x : |S_{k,r}(x)| > \delta K = \frac{\delta K}{k} k \right\} \leq \exp(-c_q \frac{\delta K}{k} k) = \exp(-c_q \delta K).$$

Thus

$$\text{mes} \mathbb{X}_r \leq K \times \exp(-c_q \delta K).$$

□

Theorem 2.15. *There exists $\check{N}(p, q, \omega)$ such that for any $N \geq \check{N}$, any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$ and $\delta < 1$*

$$\text{mes}(\{x : |\frac{1}{N} \log \|T_N(re(x))\| - J_{N,r}(E)| > \delta\}) < \exp(-\check{c}\delta^2 N),$$

where $\check{c} = \check{c}(p, q, \omega)$.

Proof. Set

$$\mathbb{Y}_r := \{x : |\frac{1}{N} \log \|T_N(re(x))\| - \frac{1}{N} \int \log \|T_N(re(x))\| dx| > \delta\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_r &\subseteq \{x : |\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K u_N(re(x + k\omega)) - u_N(re(\cdot))| > \frac{\delta}{2}\} \cup \{x : u_N(re(x)) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K u_N(re(x + k\omega)) > \frac{\delta}{2}\} \\ &\quad \cup \{x : u_N(re(x)) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K u_N(re(x + k\omega)) < -\frac{\delta}{2}\} \\ &:= \mathbb{Y}_{0,r} \cup \mathbb{Y}_{+,r} \cup \mathbb{Y}_{-,r}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $K = C_4 \delta N$. By Lemma 2.12,

$$\text{mes } \mathbb{Y}_{0,r} < \exp(-\frac{c}{2} \delta K) = \exp(-C_4 \times c \delta^2 N).$$

We need to estimate $\text{mes } \mathbb{Y}_{\pm,r}$. Due to part (2) of Corollary 2.3, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_{+,r} &\subseteq \{x : KC_1 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k-1+N)\omega))q(ze((k+N)\omega))| > \frac{N\delta}{2}\}, \\ \mathbb{Y}_{-,r} &\subseteq \{x : -KC_1 + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze(k\omega))q(ze((k+1)\omega))| < -\frac{N\delta}{2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $C_4 < \frac{1}{4C_1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &KC_1 - \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k-1+N)\omega))q(ze((k+N)\omega))| > \frac{N\delta}{2} \\ \Rightarrow &\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k-1+N)\omega))q(ze((k+N)\omega))| < -\frac{\delta N}{4} = -\frac{K}{4C_4}. \\ (2.9) \quad &\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k-1+N)\omega))q(ze((k+N)\omega))| - \sum_{m=0}^{K-1} 2 \frac{K-m}{K} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \log |q(re(x))| dx \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{K-k}{K} \log |q(ze((k-1+N)\omega))q(ze((k+N)\omega))| - (K+1)D_r \\ &< -\frac{K}{4C_4} - (K+1)D_r. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$\tilde{D} = \max_{1-\frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1+\frac{\rho}{2}} |D_r| < +\infty.$$

Let $C_4 < \frac{1}{8|\tilde{D}|}$ to make $\frac{1}{4C_4} + D_r = C_{5,r} > \tilde{D} > 0$. Note that $C_{5,r}$ is also continue for r . Thus

$$C_5 = \min_{1-\frac{\rho}{2} \leq r \leq 1+\frac{\rho}{2}} C_{5,r} > 0$$

Then there exists $C'_5 = C'_5(p, q) > 0$, s.t.

$$\frac{K}{4C_4} + (K + 1)D_r = C_{5,r}K + D_r \geq C_5K + D_r \geq C'_5K$$

for any K . Thus Lemma 2.14 applies for $\delta = C'_5$,

$$\text{mes}(\mathbb{Y}_{+,r}) \leq K \exp(-c_q \times C'_5 K) = C_4 \delta N \exp(-c_q \times C'_5 \times C_4 \delta N).$$

As $y \exp(-\xi y) \leq \xi^{-1}$ for any $y, \xi > 0$,

$$\text{mes}(\mathbb{Y}_{+,r}) \leq C_4 \delta N \exp(-\frac{c_q \times C'_5}{2} \times C_4 \delta N) \times \exp(-\frac{c_q \times C'_5}{2} \times C_4 \delta N) < \frac{2}{c_q \times C'_5} \exp(-\frac{c_q \times C'_5}{2} \times C_4 \delta N) < \exp(-c_{p,q} \delta N),$$

for $N \geq \check{N}$, where $\check{N}$ depends on $c_{p,q}$ and C'_5 , i.e. $\check{N} = \check{N}(p, q, \omega)$. Similarly,

$$\text{mes}(\mathbb{Y}_{-,r}) < \exp(-c_{p,q} \delta N).$$

So for $N \geq \check{N}(p, q, \omega)$

$$\text{mes } \mathbb{Y}_r < 2 \exp(-c_{p,q} \delta N) + \exp(-C_4 \times c \delta^2 N) < \exp(-\check{c} \delta^2 N),$$

where $\check{c} = \check{c}(p, q, \omega)$. □

Remark 2.16. (1) Recall that

$$\tilde{u}(z) = u_N(z) - \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log |q(\text{re}(x + n\omega))q(\text{re}(x + (n+1)\omega))|, < \tilde{u}_N(z) = \langle u_N(z) \rangle - D_r,$$

see (1.5). By Remark 2.13, Theorem 2.15, for any $N \geq \check{N}$

$$\text{mes}(\{x : |\tilde{u}_N(\text{re}(x)) - L_{N,r}(E)| > 2\delta\}) < \exp(-c_q \delta K) + \exp(-\check{c} \delta^2 N) < \exp(-4\check{c} \delta^2 N),$$

where $L_{N,r}(E) = J_{N,r} - D_r$. Hence for any $N \geq \check{N}$

$$(2.10) \quad \text{mes}(\{x : |\tilde{u}_N(\text{re}(x)) - L_{N,r}(E)| > \delta\}) < \exp(-\check{c} \delta^2 N).$$

(2) Once again let us note that the constants $c, \check{c}$ here do not depend on δ . In particular, one can choose here δ depending on N .

Lemma 2.17. *Let $1 > \rho > 0$ and suppose u is subharmonic on A_ρ such that $\sup_{z \in A_\rho} u(z) \leq 1$ and $\int_{\mathbb{T}} u(\text{re}(x)) dx \geq 0$. Then for any r_1, r_2 so that $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} \leq r_1, r_2 \leq 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$ one has*

$$|\langle u(r_1 e(\cdot)) \rangle - \langle u(r_2 e(\cdot)) \rangle| \leq C_\rho |r_1 - r_2|.$$

Proof. See [GS1] Lemma 4.1. □

Remark 2.18. It is easy to see that this lemma also holds for $u_N(z)$ with $C_\rho = C_\rho(p, q, \omega)$. Thus

$$|\int_0^1 u_N(\text{re}(\theta)) d\theta - J_{N,1}(E)| \leq C_\rho |r - 1|$$

for any $1 - \frac{\rho}{2} < r < 1 + \frac{\rho}{2}$.

Lemma 2.19. *For any $N \geq \check{N}(p, q, \omega)$*

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{1}{N} \log \|T_N(e(x), E)\| \leq J_{N,1} + C_6 \left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $C_6 = C_6(p, q, \omega)$ and $\check{N}$ is as in Theorem 2.15.

Proof. Let $0 < \delta < \frac{\rho}{4}$ be arbitrary. Note that $e(x + iy) = e^{-2\pi y} e(x)$, $1 - \frac{\rho}{4} < 1 - \frac{\delta}{C'_\rho} \leq e^{-2\pi y} \leq 1 + \frac{\delta}{C'_\rho} < 1 + \frac{\rho}{4}$, if $|y| \leq \frac{\delta}{4\pi e C'_\rho}$, where $C'_\rho = \max(1, C_\rho)$ and $e = \exp(1)$. By Remark 2.18 one has

$$(2.12) \quad \left| \int_0^1 u_N(re(\theta))d\theta - J_{N,1}(E)d\theta \right| \leq \delta, \text{ if } |y| \leq \frac{\delta}{4\pi e C'_\rho}.$$

Set

$$\mathbb{B}_y := \{x : |u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}| > 2\delta\}.$$

It follows from (2.12) that for $|y| \leq \frac{\delta}{4\pi e C'_\rho}$ holds

$$\mathbb{B}_y \subseteq \{x : |u_N(e(x + iy)) - \int_0^1 u_N(e(\theta + iy))d\theta| > \delta\}.$$

Due to Theorem 2.15 one obtains $\text{mes } \mathbb{B}_y \leq \exp(-\check{c}\delta^2 N)$. The function $u_N(e(x + iy))$ is subharmonic, for $e(x + iy) \in A_\rho$. let x_0 be arbitrary and $y_0 = 0$. Then $e(x_0) \in A_\rho$. Due to subharmonicity one has for any $t_0 < \frac{\rho}{4}$

$$\begin{aligned} u_N(e(x_0)) - J_{N,1} &\leq \frac{1}{\pi t_0^2} \iint_{|(x,y)-(x_0,0)| \leq t_0} [u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}] dx dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi t_0^2} \int_{|y| \leq t_0} \int_{|x-x_0| \leq \sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2}} [u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}] dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore

$$\int_{|x-x_0| \leq \sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2}} [u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}] dx = \left(\int_{\{|x-x_0| \leq \sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2}\} \cap \mathbb{B}_y} + \int_{\{|x-x_0| \leq \sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2}\} \setminus \mathbb{B}_y} \right) [u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}] dx.$$

Note that

$$|u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}| \leq 2\delta, \text{ if } x \notin \mathbb{B}_y \text{ and } y < \frac{\delta}{4\pi e C'_\rho}.$$

So

$$\left| \int_{\{|x-x_0| \leq \sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2}\} \setminus \mathbb{B}_y} [u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}] dx \right| \leq 2\delta \times (2\sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2}).$$

Due to Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\left| \int_{\{|x-x_0| \leq \sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2}\} \cap \mathbb{B}_y} [u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}] dx \right| \leq \left(\int_0^1 |u_N(e(x + iy)) - J_{N,1}|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\text{mes } \mathbb{B}_y)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_7 \exp(-\frac{\check{c}}{2}\delta^2 N).$$

Set $t_0 = \frac{\delta}{4\pi e C'_\rho}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} u_N(e(x)) - J_{N,1} &\leq \frac{1}{\pi t_0^2} \int_{|y| \leq t_0} [C_7 \exp(-\frac{\check{c}}{2}\delta^2 N) + 2\delta \times (2\sqrt{t_0^2 - |y|^2})] dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\pi t_0^2} \times C_7 \exp(-\frac{\check{c}}{2}\delta^2 N) \times (2t_0) + 2\delta \\ &= \frac{8eC_7C'_\rho}{\delta} \exp(-\frac{\check{c}}{2}\delta^2 N) + 2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\delta = (\frac{C_8 \log N}{N})^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $C_8 > \frac{2}{\check{c}}$. Then $\exp(-\frac{\check{c}}{2}C_8 \log N) < \frac{1}{N}$, and

$$u_N(e(x)) \leq J_{N,1} + 8eC_7C'_\rho \times (\frac{N}{C_8 \log N})^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \frac{1}{N} + 2(\frac{C_8 \log N}{N})^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq J_{N,1} + C_6(\frac{\log N}{N})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

Lemma 2.20. *For any $0 \leq x \leq 1$ and any $N \geq \check{N}$ holds*

$$\log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x), E)\| \leq NL_N + C_6(N \log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} - NF_N(x),$$

where

$$F_N(x) = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Q(x + n\omega), \quad Q(x) = \log |q(e(x))q(e(x + \omega))| - 2D.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} (2.13) \quad \log \|\tilde{M}_{[1,N]}(e(x), E)\| &= \log \|T_{[1,N]}(e(x), E)\| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log |q(e(x + n\omega))q(e(x + (n+1)\omega))| \\ &\leq NJ_N(E) + C_6(N \log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \log |q(e(x + n\omega))q(e(x + (n+1)\omega))|. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$J_N(E) = L_N(E) + D.$$

Then due to (2.13) one has

$$\log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x), E)\| \leq NL_N + C_6(N \log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} - NF_N(x).$$

□

Remark 2.21. Note that Lemma 2.20 implies, in particular that $NL_N + C_6(N \log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} - NF_N(x) \geq 0$ for any x for large N .

Lemma 2.22. *For any $0 \leq x \leq 1$ and any $k \geq \check{N}$ holds*

$$|\log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x + k\omega), E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x), E)\|| \leq 2kL_k(E) + 2C_6(N \log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} - kF_k(x) - kF_k(x + N\omega).$$

Proof. One has

$$\tilde{M}_N(e(x + k\omega), E)\tilde{M}_k(e(x), E) = \tilde{M}_k(e(x + N\omega), E)\tilde{M}_N(e(x), E).$$

Then

$$|\log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x + k\omega), E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x), E)\|| \leq \log \|\tilde{M}_k(e(x), E)\| + \log \|\tilde{M}_k(e(x + N\omega), E)\|,$$

because $\|A^{-1}\| = \|A\| \geq 1$ if $\det A = 1$. Due to Lemma 2.20,

$$\log \|\tilde{M}_k(e(x), E)\| + \log \|\tilde{M}_k(e(x + N\omega), E)\| \leq 2kL_k(E) + 2C_6(N \log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} - kF_k(x) - kF_k(x + N\omega).$$

□

Remark 2.23. Due to Lemma 2.1

$$u_N(e(x), E) \leq \log C(p, q)$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, any N and any E . Similarly,

$$|\log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x + k\omega), E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(e(x), E)\|| \leq 2k(\log C(p, q) - D) - kF_k(x) - kF_k(x + N\omega)$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, any N , any k and any E .

3. USING THE AVALANCHE PRINCIPLE

Proposition 3.1. *Let $A_1, \dots, A_n$ be a sequence of 2×2 -matrices whose determinants satisfy*

$$(3.1) \quad \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\det A_j| \leq 1.$$

Suppose that

$$(3.2) \quad \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \|A_j\| \geq \mu > n \quad \text{and}$$

$$(3.3) \quad \max_{1 \leq j < n} [\log \|A_{j+1}\| + \log \|A_j\| - \log \|A_{j+1}A_j\|] < \frac{1}{2} \log \mu.$$

Then

$$(3.4) \quad \left| \log \|A_n \cdots A_1\| + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \log \|A_j\| - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \log \|A_{j+1}A_j\| \right| < C \frac{n}{\mu}$$

with some absolute constant C .

Proof. See [GS]. □

Remark 3.2. For the rest of the paper, we do not use $e(x + iy)$ with $y \neq 0$. For that reason we write x instead of $e(x)$ in all expressions. What's more, without special statement, $N \geq \tilde{N}$ and $N \geq \tilde{K}$ from now on (δ in $\tilde{K}$ will be defined in Lemma 3.8).

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\tilde{c}$ be as in (2.10). Let $L_N(E) > 100\delta > 0$, where $\delta < 1$ is a constant not depending on N , and $L_{2N}(E) > \frac{9}{10}L_N(E)$. Let $N' = mN$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \leq \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4}\delta^2 N)$. Then*

$$|L_{N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| \leq \exp(-\tilde{c}'\delta^2 N) + \frac{2}{9m}L_N(E),$$

where $\tilde{c}' = \tilde{c}'(p, q, \omega)$. If $\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{10}\delta^2 N) \leq m \leq \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4}\delta^2 N)$, we have

$$(3.5) \quad |L_{N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N),$$

where $\hat{c} = \hat{c}(p, q, \omega)$.

Proof. By (2.10), we have for $0 \leq j \leq m-1$

$$|\tilde{u}_N(x + jN\omega, E) - L_N(E)| < \delta$$

$$|\tilde{u}_{2N}(x + jN\omega, E) - L_{2N}(E)| < \delta$$

for $x \in \mathbb{G}_1$, with

$$\text{mes}(\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}_1) \leq 2m \times \exp(-\tilde{c}\delta^2 N) < \exp(-\frac{2\tilde{c}}{3}\delta^2 N).$$

Thus when $x \in \mathbb{G}_1$,

$$\|\tilde{M}_N(x + jN\omega, E)\| > \exp(N(L_N(E) - \delta)) > \exp(\frac{99}{100}NL_N(E)),$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x + jN\omega, E)\| + \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x + (j+1)N\omega, E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x + jN\omega, E)\tilde{M}_N(x + (j+1)N\omega, E)\| \right| \\ & < 4N\delta + 2N|L_N(E) - L_{2N}(E)| < \frac{6}{25}NL_N(E), \end{aligned}$$

Since $0 \leq L_N(E) - L_{2N}(E) < \frac{1}{10}L_N(E)$. One has

$$\tilde{M}_{N'}(x, E) = \prod_{j=m}^1 \tilde{M}_N(x + (j-1)N\omega, E).$$

The avalanche principle applies for $\mu = \exp(\frac{1}{2}NL_N(E))$. Integrating over $\mathbb{G}_1$ one obtains

$$(3.7) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{G}_1} \tilde{u}_{N'}(x, E) dx + \int_{\mathbb{G}_1} \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_N(x + (j-1)N\omega, E) dx - \int_{\mathbb{G}_1} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_{2N}(x + (j-1)N\omega, E) dx \right| \leq C \frac{m}{N'} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}NL_N(E)),$$

where $N' = m \times N$. We want to replace here the integration over $\mathbb{G}_1$ by integration over $\mathbb{T}$. Recall that due to (4) in Remark 1.1

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{u}_n^2(E) dx \leq \tilde{C}(p, q)$$

for any n and any E . Hence, by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$(3.8) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}} \tilde{u}_K(E) dx \right| \leq \tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\text{mes } \mathbb{B})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for any K , any E and any $\mathbb{B} \subseteq \mathbb{T}$. Hence

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}_1} \tilde{u}_K(E) dx \right| \leq \tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\frac{\tilde{c}}{3}\delta^2 N)$$

for any K and any E . Thus

$$(3.9) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}_1} \tilde{u}_{N'}(x, E) dx + \frac{1}{m} \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}_1} \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_N(x + (j-1)N\omega, E) dx - \frac{2}{m} \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}_1} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_{2N}(x + (j-1)N\omega, E) dx \right| \leq 4\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\frac{\tilde{c}}{3}\delta^2 N).$$

Combining (3.7) with (3.9), one has

$$|L_{N'}(E) + \frac{m-2}{m}L_N(E) - \frac{2(m-1)}{m}L_{2N}(E)| \leq 4\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\frac{\tilde{c}}{3}\delta^2 N) + C \frac{m}{N'} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}NL_N(E)) \leq \exp(-\tilde{c}'\delta^2 N).$$

Thus

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |L_{N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| &\leq \exp(-\tilde{c}'\delta^2 N) + \frac{2}{m}|L_N(E) - L_{2N}(E)| \\ &< \exp(-\tilde{c}'\delta^2 N) + \frac{2}{m} \times \frac{1}{10}L_N(E) \\ &\leq \exp(-\tilde{c}'\delta^2 N) + \frac{1}{45m}C''(p, q), \end{aligned}$$

where $C''(p, q)$ is the same as (4) in Remark 1.1. If $\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{10}\delta^2 N) \leq m$, then

$$(3.11) \quad |L_{N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N).$$

□

Now, we can prove

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\tilde{c}$ be as in (2.10), $\hat{c}$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Assume that $L_{N_0}(E) > 100\delta > 0$ and $\exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) \leq \frac{\delta}{12}$, where $\delta < 1$ is a constant not depending on N_0 , and $L_{2N_0}(E) > \frac{9}{10}L_{N_0}(E)$. There exists $\tilde{N}_0 = \tilde{N}_0(p, q, \delta, N_0) \leq (\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta^2 N_0) + 1)N_0$ such that for any $N \geq \tilde{N}_0$ holds*

$$|L_N(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| < \exp(-\bar{c}'\delta^2 N_0),$$

where $\bar{c}' = \bar{c}'(p, q, \omega)$. Furthermore,

$$(3.12) \quad |L(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| < \exp(-\bar{c}\delta^2 N_0),$$

where $\bar{c} = \bar{c}(p, q, \omega)$.

Proof. We first prove the second part. By lemma 3.3 for $N'_1 = mN_0$, $\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta^2 N_0) \leq m < \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta^2 N_0) + 1$, one has

$$(3.13) \quad |L_{N'_1}(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| < \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0).$$

and

$$|L_{2N'_1}(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| < \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0).$$

In particular

$$|L_{N'_1}(E) - L_{2N'_1}(E)| < 2 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0).$$

Since $0 \leq L_{N_0}(E) - L_{2N_0}(E) < \frac{1}{10}L_{N_0}(E)$, one obtains using (3.13)

$$L_{N'_1}(E) > L_{N_0}(E) - 2(L_{N_0}(E) - L_{2N_0}(E)) - \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) > \frac{4}{5}L_{N_0}(E) - \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) > 79\delta,$$

and

$$|L_{N'_1}(E) - L_{2N'_1}(E)| \leq 2 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) < 2\delta < \frac{2}{79}L_{N'_1}(E) < \frac{1}{10}L_{N'_1}(E).$$

Set $\delta' = \frac{1}{2}\delta$, then $L_{N'_1}(E) > 100\delta'$, and Lemma 3.3 applies for $N'_2 = m_1 N'_1$, $\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_1) \leq m_1 < \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_1) + 1$,

$$|L_{N'_2}(E) + L_{N'_1}(E) - 2L_{2N'_1}(E)| \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_1).$$

Also

$$L_{N'_2}(E) > L_{N'_1}(E) - 2|L_{N'_1}(E) - L_{2N'_1}(E)| - \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_1) > \frac{4}{5}L_{N_0}(E) - 6 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) > 79\delta > 100\delta',$$

$$|L_{2N'_2}(E) + L_{N'_1}(E) - 2L_{2N'_1}(E)| \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_1),$$

$$|L_{N'_2}(E) - L_{2N'_2}(E)| < 2 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_1).$$

Since $N'_1 > 8N_0$ one has

$$\exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_1) = \exp(-\hat{c}\frac{\delta^2}{4}N'_1) < (\exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0))^2 < (\frac{\delta}{12})^2.$$

That implies, in particular

$$|L_{N'_2}(E) - L_{2N'_2}(E)| < 2 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_1) < 2\delta < \frac{1}{10}L_{N'_2}(E).$$

Then Lemma 3.3 applies for $N'_3 = m_2 N'_2$, $\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_2) \leq m_2 < \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_2) + 1$. E.T.C.. Obtain $N'_{i+1} = m_i N'_i$, $\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_i) \leq m_i < \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_i) + 1$ with the same δ' . Then

$$|L_{N'_{i+1}}(E) + L_{N'_i}(E) - 2L_{2N'_i}(E)| \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_i),$$

$$L_{N'_{i+1}}(E) > L_{N'_i}(E) - 2|L_{N'_i}(E) - L_{2N'_i}(E)| - \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_i) > \frac{4}{5}L_{N_0}(E) - \sum_{j=1}^i (\frac{1}{2})^j \delta \geq 79\delta > 50\delta = 100\delta',$$

$$|L_{2N'_{i+1}}(E) + L_{N'_i}(E) - 2L_{2N'_i}(E)| \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_i),$$

$$|L_{N'_{i+1}}(E) - L_{2N'_{i+1}}(E)| < 2 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_i),$$

$$4 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_i) < (\frac{1}{2})^{i+1} \delta,$$

and

$$|L_{N'_{i+1}}(E) - L_{2N'_{i+1}}(E)| < 2\delta < \frac{1}{10}L_{N'_{i+1}}(E).$$

What's more,

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} |L_{N'_{i+1}}(E) - L_{N'_i}(E)| &\leq |L_{N'_{i+1}}(E) + L_{N'_i}(E) - 2L_{2N'_i}(E)| + 2|L_{N'_i}(E) - L_{2N'_i}(E)| \\ &< \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_i) + 4 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}) < 5 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}), \quad i \geq 2 \\ |L_{N'_2}(E) - L_{N'_1}(E)| &< 5 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0). \end{aligned}$$

Since $L_{N'_i} \rightarrow L(E)$ with $i \rightarrow \infty$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.15) \quad |L(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| &= \left| \sum_{i \geq 1} (L_{N'_{i+1}}(E) - L_{N'_i}(E)) + L_{N'_1}(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E) \right| \\
 &\leq \sum_{s \geq 1} |L_{N'_{s+1}}(E) - L_{N'_s}(E)| + |L_{N'_1}(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| \\
 &= \sum_{s \geq 2} |L_{N'_{s+1}}(E) - L_{N'_s}(E)| + |L_{N'_2}(E) - L_{N'_1}(E)| + |L_{N'_1}(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| \\
 &< \sum_{s \geq 2} 5 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}) + 5 \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) + \exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) \\
 &< \exp(-\bar{c}\delta^2 N_0).
 \end{aligned}$$

That finishes we second part. We prove now the first part. Note that just as in (3.15) one obtains

$$(3.16) \quad |L_{N'_i}(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{N_0}(E)| \leq \exp(-\bar{c}\delta^2 N_0)$$

for $i \geq 1$. Let $N \geq \tilde{N}_0 := N'_1$ be arbitrary. Find i such that $N'_i \leq N < N'_{i+1}$. Recall that

$$N'_i = m_{i-1}N'_{i-1}, \quad \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}\right) \leq m_{i-1} < \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}\right) + 1,$$

$$N'_{i+1} = m_i N'_i, \quad \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_i\right) \leq m_i < \exp\left(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_i\right) + 1,$$

here $N'_0 := N_0$ for convenience. Consider two cases:

- (1) $N \leq \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1})N'_{i-1}$. In this case $\frac{N'_{i-1}}{N} \leq \frac{N'_{i-1}}{N'_i} \leq \exp(-\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1})$. Then find $\tilde{m}$, $m_{i-1} \leq \tilde{m} \leq \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1})$, such that

$$\tilde{m}N'_{i-1} \leq N < (\tilde{m} + 1)N'_{i-1}.$$

Then by Lemma 3.3

$$(3.17) \quad |L_{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(E) + L_{N'_{i-1}}(E) - 2L_{2N'_{i-1}}(E)| < \exp(-\hat{c}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).$$

Note that

$$N - \tilde{m}N'_{i-1} \leq N'_{i-1},$$

and by Remark 2.23

$$\begin{aligned}
 &|\log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(x, E)\|| \leq \log \|\tilde{M}_{N - \tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(x + \tilde{m}N'_{i-1}\omega, E)\| \\
 &\leq N'_{i-1}(\log C(p, q) - D) - (N - \tilde{m}N'_{i-1})F_{N - \tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(x + \tilde{m}N'_{i-1}\omega).
 \end{aligned}$$

We know that

$$\text{mes}(\{x : |kF_k(x) - k| < F_k(x) > | > k\delta\}) < \exp(-c\delta k)$$

for any k . Since $< F_k > = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.18) \quad |\log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(x, E)\|| &\leq N'_{i-1}(\log C(p, q) - D) + N'_{i-1} \\
 &< \hat{C}'(p, q)N'_{i-1},
 \end{aligned}$$

if $x \notin \hat{\mathbb{B}}$, $\text{mes } \hat{\mathbb{B}} < \exp(-cN'_{i-1})$. Integrating (3.18) over $\mathbb{T} \setminus \hat{\mathbb{B}}$ and using (3.8), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.19) \quad |L_N(E) - \frac{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}{N}L_{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(E)| &< \hat{C}'(p, q)\frac{N'_{i-1}}{N} + 2\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \exp(-\frac{c}{2}N'_{i-1}) \\
 &\leq \hat{C}'(p, q) \exp(-\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}) + 2\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \exp(-\frac{c}{2}N'_{i-1}) \\
 &\leq \exp(-\tilde{c}_1\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$1 - \frac{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}{N} = \frac{N - \tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}{N} \leq \frac{N'_{i-1}}{N} \leq \exp(-\frac{\tilde{c}}{8}\delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).$$

Thus

$$(3.20) \quad |L_N(E) - L_{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(E)| \leq \exp(-\tilde{c}_2 \delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).$$

Combining (3.17) with (3.20), one obtains

$$(3.21) \quad |L_N(E) + L_{N'_i}(E) - 2L_{2N'_i}(E)| < \exp(-\tilde{c}_3 \delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).$$

(2) $N > \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4} \delta'^2 N'_{i-1}) N'_{i-1}$. Find $\tilde{m}'$ such that

$$\tilde{m}' N'_i \leq N < (\tilde{m}' + 1) N'_i.$$

Thus

$$\tilde{m}' > \frac{\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4} \delta'^2 N'_{i-1})}{\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8} \delta'^2 N'_{i-1}) + 1} < \frac{\exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{4} \delta'^2 N'_{i-1})}{2 \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8} \delta'^2 N'_{i-1})} = \frac{1}{2} \exp(\frac{\tilde{c}}{8} \delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).$$

Since $N < N'_{i+1}$, then $\tilde{m}' < m_i$. It implies due to Lemma 3.4

$$(3.22) \quad |L_{\tilde{m}' N'_i}(E) + L_{N'_i}(E) - 2L_{2N'_i}(E)| < \exp(-\tilde{c}' \delta'^2 N'_i) + \frac{2}{9\tilde{m}'} L_{N'_i}(E).$$

As in Case (1), one has

$$(3.23) \quad |L_N(E) - L_{\tilde{m}N'_{i-1}}(E)| < \frac{\hat{C}''(p, q)}{\tilde{m}'} \leq \exp(-\tilde{c}_4 \delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).$$

Combining (3.22) with (3.23), one obtains

$$(3.24) \quad |L_N(E) + L_{N'_i}(E) - 2L_{2N'_i}(E)| < \exp(-\tilde{c}_5 \delta'^2 N'_{i-1}).$$

Combining (3.16) with (3.21) or (3.24), as in (3.15), one obtains

$$|L_N(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{N_0}(E)| < \exp(-\tilde{c}' \delta^2 N_0),$$

where $\tilde{c}' = \tilde{c}'(p, q, \omega)$. □

Lemma 3.5. Assume $L(E_0) > 0$. There exists $\check{C}(p, q, E_0)$ such that with $\rho'_0(E_0, N) = \frac{L(E_0)}{200} \exp(-\check{C}(p, q, E_0)N)$, one has

$$|L_N(E_0) - L_N(E)| < \frac{L(E_0)}{100},$$

for any $|E - E_0| < \rho'_0(E_0, N)$ and any N .

Proof. Note that

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} |||T_N(x, E_0)|| - ||T_N(x, E)||| &\leq ||T_N(x, E_0) - T_N(x, E)|| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (||B(x + (N-1)\omega, E_0) \times \cdots \times B(x + (j+1)\omega, E_0)|| \times \\ &\quad ||B(x + j\omega, E_0) - B(x + j\omega, E)|| \times ||B(x + (j-1)\omega, E) \times \cdots \times B(x, E)||) \\ &\leq NC(p, q)^{N-1} |E_0 - E|, \end{aligned}$$

see (1) in Lemma 2.1. By (1.4), one has

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} |||\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)|| - ||\tilde{M}_N(x, E)||| &= \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{|q(x + n\omega)q(x + (n+1)\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} |||T_N(x, E_0)|| - ||T_N(x, E)||| \\ &\leq \frac{NC(p, q)^{N-1} |E_0 - E|}{\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} |q(x + n\omega)q(x + (n+1)\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \end{aligned}$$

Assume for instance that $\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| \geq \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.27) \quad |\log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|| &= \log \frac{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\|}{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|} = \log(1 + \frac{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| - \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|}{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|}) \\
 &\leq \frac{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| - \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|}{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|} \leq \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| - \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| \\
 &\leq \frac{NC(p, q)^{N-1}|E_0 - E|}{\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} |q(x + n\omega)q(x + (n+1)\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Due to (1) in Remark 2.13 for any δ and any K

$$\text{mes}(\{x : |\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{2} \log |q(x + k\omega)q(x + (k+1)\omega)| - K < \frac{1}{2} \log |q(x)q(x + \omega)| > | > \delta K\}) < \exp(-c_q \delta K).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.28) \quad \left| \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2} \log |q(x + k\omega)q(x + (k+1)\omega)| \right| &< |N| < \frac{1}{2} \log |q(x)q(x + \omega)| > | + \frac{800\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L(E_0)c_q} N \\
 &= |D|N + \frac{800\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L(E_0)c_q} N = \hat{C}(q, p, E_0)N,
 \end{aligned}$$

if $x \notin \mathbb{B}_1$, $\text{mes } \mathbb{B}_1 < \exp(-c_q \times \frac{800\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L(E_0)c_q} N) = \exp(-\frac{800\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L(E_0)} N)$, where constant $\tilde{C}(p, q)$ comes from (4) in Remark 1.1. The same estimate holds if $\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| \leq \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|$. So

$$(3.29) \quad |\log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|| \leq NC(p, q)^{N-1}|E_0 - E| \exp(\hat{C}(p, q, E_0)N) \leq \exp(\check{C}(p, q, E_0)N)|E_0 - E|,$$

if $x \notin \mathbb{B}_1$, $\text{mes } \mathbb{B}_1 < \exp(-\frac{800\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L(E_0)} N)$. Set $\rho'_0 = \frac{L(E_0)}{200} \exp(-\check{C}(p, q, E_0)N)$. Then, if $|E - E_0| \leq \rho'_0$,

$$|\log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|| < \frac{L(E_0)}{200},$$

if $x \notin \mathbb{B}_1$, $\text{mes } \mathbb{B}_1 < \exp(-\frac{800\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L(E_0)} N)$,

$$(3.30) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{B}_1} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E_0)\| - \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{B}_1} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| \right| < \frac{L(E_0)}{200}.$$

Due to (3.8),

$$|\int_{\mathbb{B}_1} \tilde{u}_N dx| \leq \tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\frac{400\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L(E_0)} N)$$

for E or E_0 . As $y \exp(-\xi y) \leq \xi^{-1}$ for any $y, \xi > 0$. Thus

$$(3.31) \quad |\int_{\mathbb{B}_1} \tilde{u}_N dx| \leq \frac{L(E_0)}{400N} \leq \frac{L(E_0)}{400}$$

for E or E_0 . Combining (3.30) with (3.31), one has

$$|L_N(E_0) - L_N(E)| < \frac{L(E_0)}{200N} + 2\frac{L(E_0)}{400} \leq \frac{L(E_0)}{100}.$$

□

Lemma 3.6. Assume $L(E_0) > 0$. There exists $\rho'_0 = \rho'_0(p, q, E_0, \omega) > 0$ and $\tilde{N}_0 = \tilde{N}_0(p, q, E_0, \omega) < +\infty$ such that for any $N \geq \tilde{N}_0$ and any $|E - E_0| < \rho'_0$

$$|L_N(E) - L(E)| < \frac{1}{20}L(E), \quad \frac{11}{10}L(E_0) > L(E) > \frac{9}{10}L(E_0).$$

Proof. One has $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L(E_0) = L(E_0)$. Therefore there exists $N_0 = N_0(p, q, \omega, E_0)$ s.t. $|L_n(E_0) - L(E_0)| < \frac{L(E_0)}{100}$ for $n \geq N_0(p, q, \omega, E_0)$. It implies that $L_{N_0}(E_0) - L_{2N_0}(E_0) < \frac{L(E_0)}{100}$, as $L(E_0) \leq L_{2N_0}(E_0) \leq L_{N_0}(E_0)$. Set $\delta = \min(\frac{1}{200}L(E_0), \frac{1}{2})$. We can assume also that $\exp(-\hat{c}\delta^2 N_0) \leq \frac{\delta}{12}$, $\exp(-\bar{c}\delta^2 N_0) < \frac{1}{50}L(E_0)$ and $\exp(-\bar{c}'\delta^2 N_0) < \frac{1}{50}L(E_0)$, where $\hat{c}$ is as in Lemma 3.3, $\bar{c}$ and $\bar{c}'$ are as in Lemma 3.4. Using Lemma 3.5 applied to N_0 and $2N_0$. One has for $|E - E_0| < \rho'_0(E_0, 2N_0)$

$$(3.32) \quad L_{N_0}(E) \geq L(E_0) - |L_{N_0}(E) - L_{N_0}(E_0)| - |L_{N_0}(E_0) - L(E_0)| > L(E_0) - \frac{L(E_0)}{100} - \frac{L(E_0)}{100} = \frac{49}{50}L(E_0),$$

and

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} |L_{N_0}(E) - L_{2N_0}(E)| &\leq |L_{N_0}(E) - L_{N_0}(E_0)| + |L_{N_0}(E_0) - L_{2N_0}(E_0)| + |L_{2N_0}(E_0) - L_{2N_0}(E)| \\ &< \frac{L(E_0)}{100} + \frac{L(E_0)}{100} + \frac{L(E_0)}{100} = \frac{3}{100}L(E_0) < \frac{1}{10}L_{N_0}(E). \end{aligned}$$

Thus Lemma 3.4 applies for $L_{N_0}(E)$, δ , N_0 and E , then there exists $\tilde{N}_0 = \tilde{N}_0(p, q, \delta, N_0) \leq (\exp(\frac{\hat{c}}{8}\delta^2 N_0) + 1)N_0$ such that for any $N \geq \tilde{N}_0$ holds

$$|L_N(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| < \exp(-\bar{c}'\delta^2 N_0),$$

and

$$(3.34) \quad |L(E) + L_{N_0}(E) - 2L_{2N_0}(E)| < \exp(-\bar{c}\delta^2 N_0),$$

where $\bar{c}' = \bar{c}'(p, q, \omega)$ and $\bar{c} = \bar{c}(p, q, \omega)$ are as in Lemma 3.5. These imply

$$(3.35) \quad |L(E) - L_N(E)| \leq \exp(-\bar{c}'\delta^2 N_0) + \exp(-\bar{c}\delta^2 N_0) < \frac{1}{50}L(E_0) + \frac{1}{50}L(E_0) = \frac{1}{25}L(E_0).$$

Combining (3.32), (3.33) with (3.34), one obtains

$$(3.36) \quad \begin{aligned} |L(E_0) - L(E)| &\leq |L(E) + L_{\tilde{N}_0}(E) - 2L_{2\tilde{N}_0}(E)| + |L(E_0) - L_{\tilde{N}_0}(E)| + 2|L_{\tilde{N}_0}(E) - L_{2\tilde{N}_0}(E)| \\ &< \frac{1}{50}L(E_0) + \frac{1}{50}L(E_0) + 2\frac{3}{100}L(E_0) = \frac{1}{10}L(E_0). \end{aligned}$$

It implies

$$(3.37) \quad \frac{11}{10}L(E_0) > L(E) > \frac{9}{10}L(E_0),$$

and

$$|L(E) - L_N(E)| < \frac{1}{25}L(E_0) < \frac{1}{25} \times \frac{10}{9}L(E) = \frac{2}{45}L(E) < \frac{1}{20}L(E).$$

□

Lemma 3.7. Assume $L(E_0) > 0$. Let ρ'_0 be as in Lemma 3.6. Fix any $0 < \kappa < 1$. Let $K = \frac{\kappa}{20}N$. Then for there exists N_1 s.t. $N \geq N_1$ and for any $E \in (E_0 - \rho'_0, E_0 + \rho'_0)$ holds

$$\text{mes} \{x : |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + k\omega, E)| > \kappa L(E)\} < \exp(-c''\kappa L(E)N),$$

where constant c'' depends only on p, q, ω , but does not depend on E_0 or E or κ . The number N_1 depends on p, q, ω, E_0 and κ .

Proof. Choose $\bar{N}_0$ s.t.

$$(3.38) \quad \bar{N}_0 > \max\left(\frac{800(\log C(p, q) - D)}{\kappa^2 L(E_0)}, \frac{20C_6}{\kappa^2 L(E_0)}, 20, \frac{1}{\kappa}, \tilde{N}_0\right)$$

where $(\log C(p, q) - D)$ is as in Remark 2.23, C_6 is as in Lemma 2.19, $\tilde{N}_0$ is as in Lemma 3.6. Thus

$$(3.39) \quad L_K(E) < (1 + \frac{1}{20})L(E),$$

for any $K \geq \bar{N}_0$ and any $E \in (E_0 - \rho'_0, E_0 + \rho'_0)$. Finally, we assume that

$$(3.40) \quad \log K < K^{\frac{1}{6}},$$

if $K \geq \bar{N}_0$. Using Lemma 2.22 and Remark 2.23 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + k\omega, E)| &\leq \frac{1}{KN} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\bar{N}_0} 2k(\log C(p, q) - D) + \sum_{k=\bar{N}_0+1}^K 2kL_k(E) + \sum_{k=\bar{N}_0+1}^K 2C_6(k \log k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{KN} \sum_{k=1}^K (kF_k(x) + kF_k(x + N\omega)) \\ &= (I) + (II). \end{aligned}$$

Take here $N \geq \bar{N}_0^3$, $K = \frac{\kappa}{20}N$. Note that $N_0\kappa > 1$, so $K = \frac{\kappa}{20}N > \frac{\bar{N}_0^2}{20} \geq \bar{N}_0$. Thus, (3.39) and (3.40) holds. One has

$$\begin{aligned} (3.41) \quad (I) &< \frac{\bar{N}_0^2(\log C(p, q) - D)}{KN} + 4\frac{21}{20}L(E)\frac{K}{N} + \frac{C_6K^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log K)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{N} \\ &< \frac{\kappa L(E_0)}{20} + \frac{\kappa}{4}L(E) + \frac{\kappa L(E_0)}{20} < \frac{1}{2}\kappa L(E), \end{aligned}$$

see (3.38), (3.39), (3.40) and Lemma 3.6. If

$$\sum_{k=1}^K kF_k(x, E) < -\frac{KN}{4}\kappa L(E),$$

then

$$\exists k, \text{ s.t. } kF_k(x, E) < -\frac{N}{4}\kappa L(E).$$

We know that

$$\text{mes}(\{x : |kF_k(x) - k < F_k(x) > | > k\delta\}) < \exp(-c\delta k),$$

Since $\langle F_k \rangle = 0$, then

$$\text{mes}(\{x : kF_k(x) < -\frac{N}{4}\kappa L(E)\}) \leq \text{mes}(\{x : |kF_k(x)| > \frac{N}{4}\kappa L(E) < \exp(-c\frac{N\kappa L(E)}{4k})k = \exp(-c_2\kappa NL(E)).$$

So

$$\text{mes}\{x : \sum_{k=1}^K kF_k(x) < -\frac{KN}{4}L(E)\} \leq K \exp(-c_2\kappa NL(E)) = K \exp(-c_220KL(E)).$$

Sine $y \exp(-\xi y) \leq \xi^{-1}$ for any $\xi, y > 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} (3.42) \quad \text{mes}\{x : \sum_{k=1}^K kF_k(x) < -\frac{KN}{4}L(E)\} &\leq K \exp(-c_220KL(E)) = K \exp(-c_210KL(E)) \exp(-c_210KL(E)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{10c_2L(E)} \exp(-c_210KL(E)) = \frac{1}{10c_2L(E)} \exp(-\frac{c_2}{2}\kappa L(E)N) \\ &\leq \exp(-c'_2\kappa L(E)N), \end{aligned}$$

if N is large enough depending on $L(E_0)$ and κ (see Lemma 3.6 and (3.38)). Combining (3.41) with (3.42) one has

$$\text{mes}\{x : |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + j\omega, E)| > \kappa L(E)\} \leq 2 \exp(-c'_2\kappa NL(E)) < \exp(-c''\kappa L(E)N),$$

where constant c'' depends only on p, q, ω . □

Lemma 3.8. Assume $L(E_0) > 0$. Let ρ'_0 be as in Lemma 3.6, N_1 be as in Lemma 3.7 with $\kappa = \frac{1}{40}$. Then for $N \geq N_1$ and any $E \in (E_0 - \rho'_0, E_0 + \rho'_0)$ holds

$$\text{mes}\{x : |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - L(E)| > \frac{L(E)}{10}\} < \exp(-cL(E)N),$$

where constant c depends only on p, q, ω , but does not depend on E or E_0 .

Proof. Due to Remark 2.13 for $K > \check{K}$ holds

$$\text{mes} \{x : |\sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + k\omega, E) - K < \tilde{u}_N(\cdot, E) >| > \delta K\} \leq \exp(-\hat{c}\delta K),$$

where $\hat{c} = \hat{c}(p, q, \omega)$. Set $\delta = \frac{L(E)}{40}$. Thus $\check{K} = \check{K}(p, q, \omega, E_0)$. Due to Lemma 3.6, $L_N(E) < (1 + \frac{1}{20})L(E)$ if $N \geq \tilde{N}_0$, where $\tilde{N}_0$ is as in Lemma 3.6. Note that if

$$|\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + k\omega, E) - < \tilde{u}_N(\cdot, E) >| \leq \delta,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} |\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + j\omega, E) - L(E)| &\leq |\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + j\omega, E) - L_N(E)| + |L_N(E) - L(E)| < \delta + \frac{1}{20}L(E) \\ &= \frac{1}{40}L(E) + \frac{1}{20}L(E) = \frac{3}{40}L(E) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\text{mes} \{x : |\frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + j\omega, E) - L(E)| > \frac{3}{40}L(E)\} < \exp(-\frac{\hat{c}}{40}L(E)K).$$

Let $K = \frac{N}{800}$ as in Lemma 3.7, with $\kappa = \frac{1}{40}$. Then for $N \geq N_1$ holds

$$\text{mes} \{x : |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{u}_N(x + k\omega, E)| > \frac{L(E)}{40}\} \leq \exp(-\frac{c''}{40}L(E)N).$$

Recall that $N_1 > \tilde{N}_0$ with $K = \frac{N}{800}$ (see (3.38)). Let $N \geq N_1$. Then

$$\text{mes} \{x : |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - L(E)| > \frac{L(E)}{10}\} < \exp(-\frac{\hat{c}}{32000}L(E)N) + \exp(-\frac{c''}{40}L(E)N) < \exp(-c_4L(E)N),$$

c_4 depends only on p, q, ω . Here we replace c_4 by c for convenient notations. $\square$

Lemma 3.9. Assume $L(E_0) > 0$. Let ρ'_0 be as in Lemma 3.6, N_1 be as in Lemma 3.7 with $\kappa = \frac{1}{40}$, c be as in lemma 3.8. Let $N \geq N_1$ and $E \in (E_0 - \rho'_0, E_0 + \rho'_0)$ be arbitrary. Let $N' = mN, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\exp(\frac{c}{10}L(E)N) \leq m \leq \exp(\frac{c}{4}L(E)N)$. Then

$$(3.43) \quad |L_{N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| \leq \exp(-c_6L(E)N),$$

where $c_6 = c_6(p, q, \omega)$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{G}_j = \{x : |\tilde{u}_N(x + j\omega N) - L(E)| \leq \frac{1}{10}L(E)\} \cap \{x : |\tilde{u}_{2N}(x + j\omega N) - L(E)| \leq \frac{1}{10}L(E)\}$. By Lemma 3.8, $\text{mes}(\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}_j) \leq 2 \exp(-cL(E)N)$ for any j . Set $\mathbb{G} = \bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq m-1} \mathbb{G}_j$. Then $\text{mes}(\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}) \leq \exp(-\frac{2c}{3}L(E)N)$. One has

$$\|\tilde{M}_N(x + jN\omega, E)\| > \exp(\frac{9}{10}NL(E)),$$

and

$$(3.44) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\log \|\tilde{M}_N(x + jN\omega, E)\| + \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x + (j+1)N\omega, E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x + jN\omega, E)\tilde{M}_N(x + (j+1)N\omega, E)\| \\ &< \frac{1}{10}NL(E) + \frac{1}{10}NL(E) + \frac{1}{10}2NL(E) = \frac{2}{5}NL(E), \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{G}, 0 \leq j \leq m$. One has

$$\tilde{M}_{N'}(x, E) = \prod_{j=m}^1 \tilde{M}_N(x + (j-1)N\omega, E).$$

If $x \in \mathbb{G}$, the avalanche principle applies with $\mu = \exp(\frac{9}{10}NL(E))$. So

$$\left| \log \|\tilde{M}_{N'}(x, E)\| + \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x + (j-1)N\omega, E)\| - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \log \|\tilde{M}_{2N}(x + (j-1)N\omega, E)\| \right| \leq C \frac{m}{\mu} = Cm \exp(-\frac{9}{10}NL(E)).$$

Dividing by N' and integrating over $\mathbb{G}$, one obtains

$$(3.45) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{G}} \tilde{u}_{N'}(x, E) dx + \frac{1}{m} \int_{\mathbb{G}} \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_N(x + (j-1)N\omega, E) dx - \frac{2}{m} \int_{\mathbb{G}} \sum_{j=1}^{m-2} \tilde{u}_{2N}(x + (j-1)N\omega, E) dx \right| \leq C \frac{m}{N'} \exp(-\frac{9}{10}NL_N(E)) \leq C \exp(-\frac{9}{10}NL_N(E)).$$

Due to (3.8)

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}} \tilde{u}_K dx \right| \leq \tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\frac{c}{3}L(E)N)$$

for any K . Thus

$$(3.46) \quad \left| \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}} \tilde{u}_{N'}(x, E) dx + \frac{1}{m} \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}} \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_N(x + jN\omega, E) dx - \frac{2}{m} \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{G}} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \tilde{u}_{2N}(x + jN\omega, E) dx \right| \leq 4\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\frac{c}{3}L(E)N).$$

Combining (3.46) with (3.45), one has

$$|L_{N'}(E) + \frac{m-2}{m}L_N(E) - \frac{2(m-1)}{m}L_{2N}(E)| \leq 4\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-\frac{c}{3}L(E)N) + C \exp(-\frac{9}{10}NL(E)) \leq \exp(-c_5L(E)N).$$

As $\exp(\frac{c}{10}L(E)N) \leq m$, then

$$(3.47) \quad |L_{N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| \leq \exp(-c_6L(E)N),$$

where $c_6 = c_6(p, q, \omega)$. □

Lemma 3.10. Assume $L(E_0) > 0$. Let ρ'_0 be as in Lemma 3.6, N_1 be as in Lemma 3.7 with $\kappa = \frac{1}{40}$. Let $N \geq N_1$ and $E \in (E_0 - \rho'_0, E_0 + \rho'_0)$ be arbitrary. Then

$$(3.48) \quad |L(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| < \exp(-cL(E)N),$$

where $c = c(p, q, \omega)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.9 for $N' = mN$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\exp(\frac{c}{8}NL(E)) \leq m < \exp(\frac{c}{8}NL(E)) + 1$, one has

$$|L_{N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| < \exp(-c_6L(E)N),$$

and

$$|L_{2N'}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| < \exp(-c_6L(E)N).$$

In particular

$$|L_{N'}(E) - L_{2N'}(E)| < 2 \exp(-c_6L(E)N).$$

Pick $\exp(\frac{c}{8}NL(E)) \leq m_1 < \exp(\frac{c}{8}NL(E)) + 1$. Set $N'_1 = m_1N$. Similarly define $N'_2 = m_2N'_1$, i.e. with N'_1 in the role of N . E.T.C., obtain N'_s such that

$$|L_{N'_{s+1}}(E) + L_{N'_s}(E) - 2L_{2N'_s}(E)| < \exp(-c_6L(E)N'_s),$$

$$|L_{2N'_{s+1}}(E) + L_{N'_s}(E) - 2L_{2N'_s}(E)| < \exp(-c_6L(E)N'_s),$$

$$|L_{N'_{s+1}}(E) - L_{2N'_{s+1}}(E)| < 2 \exp(-c_6L(E)N'_s).$$

One has $L_{N'_s}(E) \rightarrow L(E)$ with $s \rightarrow \infty$. So

(3.49)

$$\begin{aligned}
|L(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| &= \left| \sum_{s \geq 1} (L_{N'_{s+1}}(E) - L_{N'_s}(E)) + L_{N'_1}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{s \geq 1} |L_{N'_{s+1}}(E) - L_{N'_s}(E)| + |L_{N'_1}(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| \\
&< \sum_{s \geq 2} 5 \exp(-c_6 L(E) N'_{s-1}) + 5 \exp(-c_6 L(E) N) + \exp(-c_6 L(E) N) < \exp(-c_7 L(E) N).
\end{aligned}$$

Here again we change c_7 by c for convenient notations. $\square$

4. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Assume $\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| \geq \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E')\|$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.1) \quad \left| \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| - \log \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E')\| \right| &= \log \frac{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E, \omega)\|}{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E', \omega)\|} = \log \left(1 + \frac{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| - \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E')\|}{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| - \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E')\|}{\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\|} \leq \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E)\| - \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E')\| \\
&= \frac{\|T_N(x, E)\| - \|T_N(x, E')\|}{\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} |q(x + n\omega)q(x + (n+1)\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \\
&\leq \frac{\|T_N(x, E) - T_N(x, E')\|}{\prod_{n=0}^{N-1} |q(x + n\omega)q(x + (n+1)\omega)|^{\frac{1}{2}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

One obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.2) \quad \|T_N(x, E) - T_N(x, E')\| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (\|B(x + (N-1)\omega, E) \times \cdots \times B(x + (j+1)\omega, E)\| \times \\
&\quad \|B(x + j\omega, E) - B(x + j\omega, E')\| \times \|B(x + (j-1)\omega, E') \times \cdots \times B(x, E')\|) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left\| \prod_{m=1}^{N-j} B(x + (N-m)\omega, E) \right\| \times \left\| \prod_{m=j-1}^0 B(x + m\omega, E') \right\| \times |E - E'|.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (4.1), (4.2) and Lemma 2.20, then

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.3) (4.1) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left\| \prod_{m=1}^{N-j} B(x + (N-m)\omega, E) \right\| \times \left\| \prod_{m=j-1}^0 B(x + m\omega, E') \right\| \times \exp(-ND) \times |E - E'| \\
&\quad \times \exp \left(- \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2} \log |q(x + n\omega)q(x + (n+1)\omega)| + ND \right) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left\| \prod_{m=1}^{N-j} B(x + (N-m)\omega, E) \right\| \times \left\| \prod_{m=j-1}^0 B(x + m\omega, E') \right\| \times \exp(-ND) \times \exp(-NF_N(x)) \times |E - E'|
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.35) with (3.37), one has

$$(4.4) \quad L_N(E) \leq L(E) + \frac{1}{25} L(E_0) < \frac{11}{10} L(E_0) + \frac{1}{25} L(E_0) = \frac{57}{50} L(E_0)$$

for any $N \geq \tilde{N}_0$ and any $E \in (E_0 - \rho'_0, E_0 + \rho'_0)$, where $\tilde{N}_0$ and ρ'_0 are as in Lemma 3.6. Let $N > N_2 := 2 \frac{\log C(p,q) - D}{L(E_0)} \tilde{N}_0 \geq 2\tilde{N}_0$ and $E, E' \in (E_0 - \rho'_0, E_0 + \rho'_0)$, where $(\log(p, q) - D)$ is as in Remark 2.23, $\tilde{N}_0$ and ρ'_0 are as in Lemma 3.6. Due

to Lemma 2.20 and Remark 2.23, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.1) & \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{N}_0} + \sum_{j=\tilde{N}_0+1}^{N-\tilde{N}_0} + \sum_{j=N-\tilde{N}_0+1}^N \right) \left\| \prod_{m=1}^{N-j} B(x + (N-m)\omega, E) \right\| \times \left\| \prod_{m=j-1}^0 B(x + m\omega, E') \right\| \times \exp(-ND) \\
& \quad \times \exp(-NF_N(x)) \times |E - E'| \\
& \leq \left(2 \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{N}_0} \exp \left((\log C(p, q) - D)\tilde{N}_0 + \frac{57}{50}L(E_0)N + C_6 \left(\frac{\log N}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - D \right) + \sum_{j=\tilde{N}_0+1}^{N-\tilde{N}_0} \exp \left(\frac{57}{50}L(E_0)N + 2C_6 \left(\frac{\log N}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - D \right) \right) \\
& \quad \times \exp(-NF_N(x)) \times |E - E'| \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \exp \left(\frac{1}{2}L(E_0)N + \frac{57}{50}L(E_0)N + 2C_6 \left(\frac{\log N}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - D \right) \times \exp(-NF_N(x)) \times |E - E'|.
\end{aligned}$$

There exist $N_3 = N_3(p, q, \omega, E_0)$ s.t. for any $N \geq N_3$ holds

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \exp \left(\frac{82}{50}L(E_0)N + 2C_6 \left(\frac{\log N}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - D \right) \leq \exp(2L(E_0)N).$$

It implies that for any $N \geq \max(N_2, N_3)$ holds

$$(4.1) \leq \exp(2L(E_0)N) \times \exp(-NF_N(x)) \times |E - E'|.$$

It is obvious that

$$(4.1) \leq \exp(2L(E_0)N) \times \exp(-NF_N(x)) \times |E - E'|,$$

when $\|\tilde{M}_N(x, E, \omega)\| \geq \|\tilde{M}_N(x, E', \omega)\|$. Set

$$\mathbb{B} := \{x : NF_N(x) < -NL(E_0)\},$$

then

$$\text{mes}(\mathbb{B}) \leq \text{mes}(\{x : |NF_N(x) - N| > NL(E_0)\}) < \exp(-cL(E_0)N),$$

since $\langle F_N \rangle = 0$. It implies

$$(4.1) < \exp(3L(E_0)N)|E - E'|, \text{ if } x \in \mathbb{B}.$$

Due to (3.8), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.6) \quad |L_N(E) - L_N(E')| &= \int_{\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{B}} |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - \tilde{u}_N(x, E')| dx + \int_{\mathbb{B}} |\tilde{u}_N(x, E) - \tilde{u}_N(x, E')| dx \\
&< \exp(3L(E_0)N)|E - E'| + 2\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{c}{2}L(E_0)N\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $N \geq N_4 := \max(N_1, N_2, N_3)$, where N_1 is as in Lemma 3.7. Due to Lemma 3.10

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.7) \quad |L(E) - L(E')| &\leq |L(E) + L_N(E) - 2L_{2N}(E)| + |L(E') + L_N(E') - 2L_{2N}(E')| \\
&\quad + |L_N(E) - L_N(E')| + 2|L_{2N}(E) - L_{2N}(E')| \\
&< 2\exp(-c_6L(E_0)N) + 3\exp(6L(E_0)N)|E - E'| + 3\tilde{C}(p, q)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{c}{2}L(E_0)N\right) \\
&< \exp(-c_7L(E_0)N) + 3\exp(6L(E_0)N)|E - E'|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_7 = c_7(p, q, \omega)$. Set $\rho_0'' = \exp(-(6 + c_7)L(E_0)N_4)$, and $\rho_0 = \min(\rho_0', \frac{\rho_0''}{2})$. Then for $E, E' \in (E_0 - \rho_0, E_0 + \rho_0)$, there exists $N \geq N_4$ such that

$$\exp(-(6 + c_7)L(E_0)(N + 1)) \leq |E - E'| \leq \exp(-(6 + c_7)L(E_0)N).$$

It implies

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.8) \quad |L(E) - L(E')| &< 4 \exp(-c_7 L(E_0)N) = 4 \exp\left(-\frac{N}{N+1} c_7 L(E_0)(N+1)\right) < 4 \exp\left(-\frac{2c_7}{3} c_7 L(E_0)(N+1)\right) \\
 &< \exp\left(-\frac{c_7}{2} L(E_0)N\right) < |E - E'|^\beta,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta = \frac{c_7}{12+2c_7}$, only depending on p, q and ω . By (1.9), one also has

$$|J(E) - J(E')| = |L(E) - L(E')| < |E - E'|^\beta.$$

□

REFERENCES

- [AJ] A. Avila, S. Jitomirskaya, *The Ten Martini problem*. Ann. of Math. **170** (2009), 303 - 342.
- [B] J. Bourgain, *Green's Function Estimates for Lattice Schrödinger Operators and Applications*. Ann. Math. Stud. **158**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, (2005).
- [B1] J. Bourgain, *Positivity and Continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for Shifts on $\mathbb{T}^d$ with arbitrary frequency vector and real analytic potential* Journal D'analyse Mathématique **96** (2005) 313–355.
- [BG] J. Bourgain and M. Goldstein, *On Nonperturbative Localization with Quasi-periodic Potential*. Ann. of Math. **152** (2000) 835–879.
- [BJ] J. Bourgain and S. Jitomirskaya, *Continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for quasiperiodic operators with analytic potential*, J. Stat. Phys. **108**(2002) 1028–1218 .
- [BGS] J. Bourgain, M. Goldstein and W. Schlag, *Anderson localization for Schrödinger operators on $\mathbb{Z}$ with potentials given by the skew-shift*. Commun. Math. Physics **220**, (2001), 583-621 .
- [GS] M. Goldstein and W. Schlag *Hölder continuity of the integrated density of states for quasi-periodic Schrödinger equations and averages of shifts of subharmonic functions*. Ann. of Math. **154**, (2001), 155-203 .
- [GS1] M. Goldshtein and W. Schlag *Fine properties of the integrated density of states and a quantitative separation property of the Dirichlet eigenvalues*. Geom. Funct. Analysis. bf 18, (2008), 755-869.
- [J] S. Jitomirskaya, *Metal-Insulator transition for the Almost Mathieu operator*. Ann. of Math. **150**, (1999), 1159-1175 .
- [JKS] S. Jitomirskaya, D. A. Koslover and M. S. Schulties *Continuity of the Lyapunov Exponent for analytic quasi-periodic cocycles*. Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. **29** (2009), 1881 - 1905.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY, 22 HANKOU ROAD NANJING JIANGSU 210093 P.R.CHINA
 E-mail address: tao.nju@gmail.com